

**PARIS ACKERMAN & SCHMIERER LLP**

Ross H. Schmierer, Esq.  
103 Eisenhower Parkway  
Roseland, New Jersey 07068  
(973) 228-6667  
ross@paslawfirm.com

**DeNITTIS OSEFCHEN, P.C.**

Stephen Denittis  
525 Route 73 North, Suite 410  
Marlton, New Jersey 08053  
(856) 797-9951  
sdenittis@denittislaw.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

SHANI MARCUS, Individually  
and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

CVS Pharmacy, Inc.,

Defendant.

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND –  
CLASS ACTION SEEKING INJUNCTION  
AND INDIVIDUAL DAMAGES**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Plaintiff Shani Marcus (“Plaintiff”) brings this Class Action Complaint for damages, injunctive relief, and any other available legal or equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal actions of CVS Pharmacy Inc. (“CVS” or “Defendant”), in transmitting unsolicited commercial text messages to Plaintiff on Plaintiff’s cellular telephone, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., (“TCPA”), thereby invading Plaintiff’s privacy. Plaintiff alleges as follows upon personal knowledge as to herself and her own acts and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief, including investigation conducted by her attorneys.

2. The TCPA was designed to prevent calls and text messages like the ones described herein, and to protect the privacy of citizens like Plaintiff. “Voluminous consumer complaints about abuses of telephone technology – for example, computerized calls dispatched to private homes – prompted Congress to pass the TCPA.” *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740, 744 (2012).

3. In enacting the TCPA, Congress intended to give consumers a choice as to how corporate similar entities may contact them, and made specific findings that “[t]echnologies that might allow consumers to avoid receiving such calls are not universally available, are costly, are unlikely to be enforced, or place an inordinate burden on the consumer. TCPA, Pub.L. No. 102–243, § 11. In support of this, Congress found that

[b]anning such automated or prerecorded telephone calls to the home, except when the receiving party consents to receiving the call or when such calls are necessary in an emergency situation affecting the health and safety of the consumer, is the only effective means of protecting telephone consumers from this nuisance and privacy invasion.

Id. at § 12; *see also Martin v. Leading Edge Recovery Solutions, LLC*, 2012 WL 3292838, at\* 4 (N.D.Ill. Aug. 10, 2012) (citing Congressional findings on TCPA’s purpose).

4. Congress also specifically found that “the evidence presented to the Congress indicates that automated or prerecorded calls are a nuisance and an invasion of privacy, regardless of the type of call...” Id. at §§ 12-13. *See also, Mims*, 132 S. Ct. at 744.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5. This Court has federal question jurisdiction because this case arises out of violations of federal law. 47 U.S.C. §227(b); *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740 (2012).

6. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and 1441(a) because Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in Monmouth County, New Jersey.

### **PARTIES**

7. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a citizen and resident of the State of New Jersey. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10).

8. Upon information and belief, Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a foreign corporation duly organized under the laws of the State of Rhode Island with its principal place of business in the State of Rhode Island. Defendant, is and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation and is a “person,” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10). CVS is the second largest pharmacy chain in the United States, with more than 7,600 stores, and is the second largest U.S. pharmacy based on total prescription revenue. Plaintiff alleges that at all times relevant herein, Defendant conducted business in the State of New Jersey and in Monmouth County within this judicial district.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

9. At all times relevant, Plaintiff was a citizen of the State of New Jersey. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10).

10. Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation and a “person,” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10).

11. At all times relevant Defendant conducted business in New Jersey and in Monmouth County, within this judicial district.

12. In or about sometime prior to December 2014, but within the past one (1) calendar year from the filing of the instant Complaint, Plaintiff purchased certain products and filled certain prescriptions at a CVS located in Oakhurst, New Jersey.

13. During this time, Plaintiff received certain text messages notifying her that a prescription refill was ready for pick up.

14. Unlike Walgreens, CVS’s largest competitor, CVS also included within these text messages certain marketing notifications about in-house services offered by CVS.

15. However, Plaintiff never gave written consent to receive such promotional commercial text messages.

16. Moreover, CVS took no steps to actually acquire the express written consent of Plaintiff before sending out these marketing notifications.

17. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Plaintiff received unwanted and unsolicited commercial text messages containing marketing notifications.

18. Specifically, on December 22, 2014, Plaintiff received a text message from Defendant, which was sent to her cellular phone ending in 7148. The message was sent with a message code 287-898 and indicated as follows:

CVS/pharmacy: SHANI,  
your order is ready at 246  
NORWOOD AVE.,  
OAKHURST. Flu shots  
Available. Question?  
732-502-3154 Reply HELP  
for Help

*See Exhibit A.*

19. This text message sent to Plaintiff's cellular telephone was sent via an "automatic telephone dialing system," ("ATDS") as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (a)(1) and as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).

20. The telephone number that Defendant, or its agent, sent its unsolicited text message was assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1).

21. Thus, these unsolicited text messages sent to Plaintiff's cellular phone were sent not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A)(i).

22. At no time, including as of December 22, 2014, did Plaintiff provide Defendant or its agents with prior express consent to receive unsolicited text messages, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).

23. These unsolicited commercial texts sent to Plaintiff's cellular phone by Defendant, or its agents, violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

**CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

24. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of and all others similarly situated (“the Class”).

25. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, the Class, consisting of all persons within the United States who received any unsolicited text messages from Defendant which text message was not made for emergency purposes or with the recipient’s prior express consent within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

26. Defendant and its employees or agents are excluded from the Class. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in the Class, but believes the Class members number in the thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should be certified as a Class action to assist in the expeditious litigation of this matter.

27. Plaintiff and members of the Class were harmed by the acts of Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant, either directly or through its agents, illegally contacted Plaintiff and the Class members via their cellular telephones by using marketing and text messages, thereby causing Plaintiff and the Class members to incur certain cellular telephone charges or reduce cellular telephone time for which Plaintiff and the Class members previously paid, and invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and the Class members. Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby.

28. This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of economic injury on behalf of the Class, and it expressly is not intended to request any recovery for personal injury and claims related thereto. Plaintiff reserves the right to expand the Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional persons as warranted as facts are learned in further investigation and discovery.

29. The joinder of the Class members is impractical and the disposition of their claims in the Class action will provide substantial benefits both to the parties and to the court. The Class can be identified through Defendant’s records or Defendant’s agents’ records.

30. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented. The questions of law and fact to the Class predominate over questions which may affect individual Class members, including the following:

- a) Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, Defendant or its agents sent any text messages to the Class (other than a message made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) to a Class member using any automatic dialing system to any telephone number assigned to a cellular phone service;
- b) Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
- c) Whether Defendant and its agents should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.

31. As a person that received at least one marketing and/or promotional text message without Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of the Class. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class in that Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to any member of the Class.

32. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have all suffered irreparable harm as a result of the Defendant's unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class action, the Class will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy and Defendant will likely continue such illegal conduct. Because of the size of the individual Class member's claims, few, if any, Class members could afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.

33. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in handling class action claims and claims involving violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

34. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce Defendant to comply with federal and California law. The interest of Class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendant is small because the maximum statutory damages in an individual action for violation of privacy are minimal. Management of these claims is likely to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class claims.

35. Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

**COUNT I**  
**NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TCPA 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

36. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

37. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

38. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq*, Plaintiff and The Class are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

39. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

**COUNT II**  
**KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS**  
**OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

40. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

41. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

42. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., Plaintiff and The Class are entitled to an award of \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

43. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff and members of the Class respectfully pray for the following relief:

A. On the First Count and Second Count, as a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(2)(D), Plaintiff and each member of the Class is entitled to and requests five hundred dollars (\$500.00) in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B); and

B. On the First Count and Second Count, as a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(2)(D), Plaintiff and each member of the Class is entitled to and requests treble damages, as provided by statute, up to one thousand five hundred dollars (\$1,500.00), for each and every violation pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C); and;

C. An Order, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), enjoining Defendant from violating 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(2)(D); and

D. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, demands a trial by jury on all questions of fact raised by the complaint.

Dated: January 13, 2015

**PARIS ACKERMAN & SCHMIERER LLP**

By: s/ Ross H. Schmierer  
Ross H. Schmierer, Esq.  
103 Eisenhower Parkway  
Roseland, NJ 07068  
(T): (973) 228-6667  
(F): (973) 629-1246  
ross@paslawfirm.com

**DeNITTIS OSEFCHEN, P.C.**  
Stephen Denittis  
525 Route 73 North, Suite 410  
Marlton, New Jersey 08053  
(856) 797-9951  
sdenittis@denittislaw.com

**CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO L. CIV. R. 11.2**

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, this matter is not the subject of any other action pending in any court or of any pending arbitration or administrative proceeding.

**PARIS ACKERMAN & SCHMIERER LLP**  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

By: s/ Ross H. Schmierer  
Ross H. Schmierer, Esq.  
103 Eisenhower Parkway  
Roseland, New Jersey 07068  
(973) 228-6667  
ross@paslawfirm.com

Dated: January 14, 2015

**DeNITTIS OSEFCHEN, P.C.**

Stephen Denittis

525 Route 73 North, Suite 410

Marlton, New Jersey 08053

(856) 797-9951

sdenittis@denittislaw.com